



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,100	12/18/2000	Thomas E. Tahan	5181-59000	5272
7590	08/16/2004		EXAMINER	OSMAN, RAMY M
B. Noel Kivlin Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C. P.O. Box 398 Austin, TX 78767			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	
DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A/3

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/740,100	TAHAN, THOMAS E.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Ramy M Osman	2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-48 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 49,52-60,63-71 and 74-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 50,51,61,62,72 and 73 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____                                     |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Status of Claims***

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed on June 10, 2004 where applicant responded to Examiners restriction requirement. Claims 49-81 are pending.

***Election/Restrictions***

2. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 49-81 in the reply filed on June 10, 2004 is acknowledged.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 55 and 58 recites the limitation "AAS" in lines 3 and 2, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 49,52-60,63-71 and 74-81 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gooderum et al (US Patent No 5,918,018) in view of Sharma et al (US Patent No 6,754,716).

7. In reference to claim 49, Gooderum teaches a method of community separation control in a Multi-community Node (MCN) (Abstract and Summary), said method comprising:  
ensuring routing table compliance with a community separation policy (column 7 lines 50-67 and column 11 lines 40-67);

validating a data packet; allowing further processing of said data packet in response to detecting said data packet is validated; and discarding said data packet in response to detecting said data packet is not validated (column 12 lines 20-57).

Gooderum fails to explicitly teach wherein all routing table updates are validated to ensure said compliance. However, Sharma teaches routing table updates are validated to ensure compliance with network policy to prevent network attacks (Abstract and column 2 lines 37-67).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gooderum by validating routing table updates to ensure compliance as per the teachings of Sharma so as to prevent network attacks.

8. In reference to claim 52, Gooderum teaches wherein said first address is a destination address and said first address set is an Attached Address Set (column 12 lines 20-57).

9. In reference to claim 53, Gooderum teaches wherein said first address is a Network Address Community Set (NACS) corresponding to a destination address of said next hop, and wherein said first address set is an Interface Community Set (IFCS) of said network interface (column 12 lines 20-57).

10. In reference to claim 54, Gooderum teaches wherein said data packet is an outgoing data packet, and wherein validating said data packet comprises:

determining said destination address is reachable; and determining a community set corresponding to an interface over which said data packet is to be output includes a community set corresponding to said destination address (column 11 lines 44-67 and column 18 lines 35-55).

11. In reference to claim 55, Gooderum teaches wherein said data packet is an incoming data packet, and wherein validating said data packet comprises checking that a source address of said data packet is within an AAS of the interface over which said data packet was received (column 12 lines 20-57).

12. In reference to claim 56, Gooderum teaches wherein said data packet is received on a first interface of said MCN and is to be forwarded to a second interface of said MCN, and wherein validating said data packet comprises determining an intersection of an Interface Community Set (IFCS) of said first interface with an IFCS of said second interface is not null (column 7 line 50 – column 8 line 30 and column 12 lines 20-57).

13. In reference to claim 57, Gooderum teaches the method further comprising consulting a Community Information Base (CIB) (Summary, column 7 line 50 – column 8 line 3 and column 14 lines 25-44).

14. In reference to claim 58, Gooderum teaches wherein said CIB includes an IFCS corresponding to each interface of said MCN, and an AAS corresponding to each interface of said MCN indicating destination addresses or destination subnets which are reachable through each of said interfaces (Summary, column 7 line 50 – column 8 line 3, column 8 lines 25-52, column 8 line 62 – column 9 line 15, column 11 lines 19-30 and column 14 lines 25-44).

15. In reference to claim 59, Gooderum teaches the method further comprising recording an event corresponding to said update in response to determining said destination address is not within said first address set (column 17 line 60 – column 18 line 10).

16. Claims 60,63-71,74-81 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 49,52-59 as mentioned above and are therefore rejected for similar reasons.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

17. Claims 50,51,61,62,72 and 73 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

18. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:  
determining a network interface through which a next hop corresponding to an update of said updates will be reached; wherein said network interface is determined by either extracting

an identification of said network interface from said update or by finding a network interface whose network address prefix matches that of said next hop.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M Osman whose telephone number is (703) 305-8050. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO  
August 5, 2004



SALEH NAJJAR  
MARY EXAMINER